

Appl. No. 10/602,700
Amendment dated September 24, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2007

REMARKS

Please consider the following comments. Following this response, claims 1 and 6-12 are pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Priority

The applicant notes with appreciation the acknowledgement of the claim for priority under section 119 and the notice that all of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Information Disclosure Statement

The applicant acknowledges and appreciates receiving an initialed copy of the form PTO-1449 that was filed on June 25, 2003.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,754,430 to Sawada ("Sawada"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

By this response, Applicant has cancelled claims 2-5, thus rendering this rejection moot as it pertains to these claims.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite a voice inputting unit for inputting configured to input a speech uttered by a user through voice input; a display unit configured to display a switch for a switch operation; and a controlling unit configured to recognize the inputted speech to thereby execute a function according to a speech content corresponding to the recognized speech.

Applicant has also amended claim 1 to recite that the controlling unit identifies to the user a

Appl. No. 10/602,700
Amendment dated September 24, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2007

content of a destination setting that is subsequently executed, and requires the user to make an instruction for a determination of whether to affirm or negate the destination setting before the destination setting is executed, the instruction for the determination of the destination setting being able to be made by both the switching operation and via the voice input. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, on page 10, lines 3-21, and in FIG. 4.

Amended claim 1 shows that the recited voice control system allows that when a function is to be executed based on a voice input, the user has the option to affirm or negate the function by either a switching operation or a voice input. In other words, the user could affirm or negate the function by simply saying, "YES," or "NO," or by physical switching (e.g., pushing a button or touch pad).

In contrast, Sawada simply discloses a destination input means 4 and a place name input means 5 that are designed to input a destination and a place name serving as a target for the course judgment with a voice recognition device. (See, e.g., Sawada, column 6, lines 43-50, and FIG. 3.) Nothing in Sawada discloses that the entry of a destination and a place name could be affirmed or negated by both the switching operation and via the voice input. In particular, nothing in Sawada discloses or suggests that its device is capable of affirming or negating an operation by using a switching operation.

Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons given above for claim 1.

Applicant has amended claim 8 to recite notifying the user of a content of a destination setting; displaying on the display unit, simultaneously with the notifying, (i) a first switch for the user to make a first instruction to affirm the destination setting and (ii) a second switch for the user to make a second instruction to negate the destination setting; requiring the user to provide

Appl. No. 10/602,700
Amendment dated September 24, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2007

an instruction to either affirm or negate the destination setting before the destination setting is executed, the instruction to either affirm or negate the designation setting being able to be made by both voice input and a switch operation using the first and second switches; and providing, when either the first switch or the second switch is selected by the user, an instruction according to the corresponding first or second switch. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, on page 10, lines 3-21, and in FIG. 4.

Amended claim 8 shows that the recited voice input method allows that when a destination designation has been made based on a voice input, the user has the option to affirm or negate the function by either a displayed switching operation or a voice input. In other words, the user could affirm or negate the function by simply saying, "YES," or "NO," or by selecting a physical switch from a displayed first and second switch.

For reasons analogous to those given for claim 1, nothing in Sawada discloses that the entry of a destination and a place name could be affirmed or negated by both the switching operation and via the voice input. In particular, nothing in Sawada discloses or suggests displaying first and second switches, or that affirmation or negation of a designation setting could be accomplished by both voice input or a switching operation.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Sawada.

Claim Amendments

By this response, the applicant has amended claims 6 and 7 to have them correspond to the amendments made to claim 1.

Appl. No. 10/602,700
Amendment dated September 24, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2007

SEP 24 2007

New Claims

By this response, Applicant has added new claims 9-12. No new matter has been added in these new claims. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter and consider these new claims.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that, as described above, the cited prior art does not show or suggest the combination of features recited in the claims. Applicant does not concede that the cited prior art shows any of the elements recited in the claims. However, applicant has provided specific examples of elements in the claims that are clearly not present in the cited prior art.

Applicant strongly emphasizes that one reviewing the prosecution history should not interpret any of the examples Applicant has described herein in connection with distinguishing over the prior art as limiting to those specific features in isolation. Rather, for the sake of simplicity, Applicant has provided examples of why the claims described above are distinguishable over the cited prior art.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. A timely notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If questions relating to patentability remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone.

Appl. No. 10/602,700
Amendment dated September 24, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2007

Although it is not anticipated that any additional fees are due or payable, the
Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required to Deposit Account
No. 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,


Brian C. Altmiller
Reg. No. 37,271

Posz Law Group, PLC
12040 South Lakes Drive, Suite 101
Reston, VA 20191
Phone 703-707-9110
Fax 703-707-9112
Customer No. 23400